(72)

24/11/14

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH: BILASPUR

SINGLE BENCH : HON'BLE SHRI JAGDISH BHALLA, Ag. CJ

Writ Petition (C) No. 6834 of 2007

Petitioner Dilip Kumar aged about 40 S/o. Sunder Lal, Ex-Sarpanch, Gram Panchayat : Akaltari, Janpad Panchayat Bilha, Tahsil & Distt. Bilaspur (C.G.)

VERSUS

Respondents

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through : Secretary, Panchayat D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur, Distt. Raipur (C.G.)
2. Director of Panchayat, empowered under the C.G. Panchayat Raj Adhiniyam 1993, Raipur, Distt. Raipur (C.G.)
3. Abhimanyu Kumar Dhimar S/o. Rajkumar Dhimar, aged about 26 years
4. Ramphal Dhimar, S/o. Late Gajraj Dhimar, aged about 55 years
5. Suritram Dhimar, S/o Dayaram Dhimar, aged about 30 years
6. Kejuram Dhimar, S/o. Late Sukalu Ram aged about 56 years
7. Ramnarayan S/o Khamman Lal aged about 24 years
8. Mitthuram Dhimar, S/o. Late Bakhatram aged about 55 years
9. Rameshwar S/o Ramphal, aged about 22 years
10. Dinesh Kumar S/o Kejuram aged about 22 years
11. Pardeshi S/o Late Pakla Ram aged about 58 years
12. Rajendra Kashyap S/o Radheshyam Kashyap aged about 32 years
13. Ramchand Sharma S/o Late Jaitlal Sharma aged about 35 years
14. Baliram S/o Late Bisal Sahu, aged about 46 years
15. Manharan Parkar S/o. Late Harishchandra Parkar aged about 48 years

16. Ghasiram S/o Late Rangu Ram aged about 65 years
All R/o. Village : Akaltari, Janpad Panchayat Bilha, Distt. Bilaspur (C.G.)

Writ Petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India

Present: Shri N.K. Chatterjee, counsel for the petitioner.

ORAL ORDER
(Passed on 21st November, 2007)

The order under challenge is to the extent that the Court below has failed to give adequate opportunity to the petitioner for filing response. In fact it is admitted on behalf of the petitioner that eleven days' time was allowed for filing the response. It is further admitted on behalf of the petitioner that after expiry of the time no application for grant of further time to file response was filed on behalf of the petitioner. In such circumstances, it cannot be said that adequate opportunity was not afforded to the petitioner. Over and above, even the petitioner has not asked for time. No other point has been pressed in this petition.

In the light of above, no interference is warranted under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

Sd/-
Acting Chief Justice

Karode